



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HEBREW ECCLESIASTICUS.

SOME OF ITS ADDITIONS AND OMISSIONS.

IN a recent article¹ the present writer pointed out that the lately discovered fragments of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus contain some seven new lines, but on the other hand omit some seventeen common to the Greek, Syriac, and Latin versions. It is proposed here to deal with the inclusions and exclusions of the various texts somewhat more fully.

It is obvious that so long as we possess only part of this Hebrew text we have not only to make use of it to aid in the determination of the true text of the portions it covers, but also to deduce from a survey of the phenomena of these chapters canons regarding the relative value of the versions to be applied in those portions where the latter are the only sources available.

These canons can, it is true, be determined only after a careful and minute comparison of the various texts, a work which should not be done hastily. For such examination as one has subjected them to only reveals how perplexing the mutual relations are. It may perhaps be of some use, however, in indicating points of view, to make a preliminary study of a more limited kind. We propose therefore to consider the presence or absence of entire lines or groups of lines. Of omissions or additions or substitutions of phrases or words, accordingly, even when they very materially modify the sense, we shall take no account. Our problem is thus rather the comparative completeness than the relative purity of the several texts. The distinction is perhaps a little arbitrary, but it has the advantage of giving us a manageable subject. If the points we shall collect suggest any provisional generalizations, these may be useful as working hypotheses in the wider and more important investigation that lies beyond.

1. *Total number of lines to be considered.*—It will be convenient to begin by asking what is the number of distinct lines now attested in one source or another. Of course it is not quite possible to say categorically how many these are. Opinions will differ as to where lines should begin and end; and also as to what lines in the several texts are equivalent and what distinct. We shall for our present purpose

¹ *Expository Times*, March 1897, pp. 262–7. The reference there in footnote 1 on p. 265 is to the present article, which was written at the same time.

regard as equivalent any lines occurring in the same general context if they have anything at all in common. After examining with some care we have concluded to reckon such lines at 760: it will appear more clearly as we proceed, how far it is possible to give any exact number at all. The largest number of these 760 lines contained in any one source is 726 in the Latin. This is followed by the Greek with 720 and the Hebrew with 717. The Syriac comes last with 546.

2. *Distribution amongst the sources.*—As to the character of the attestation of these 760 lines, we note first of all that almost two-thirds of them, more exactly 504 lines, are attested by all our four sources—Hebrew (*H*), Greek (*G*), Syriac (*S*), and Latin (*L*). To this common matter, with which for our present purpose we have of course nothing to do, *L* adds 222 lines, *G* 216, *H* 213, and *S* 42. The first thing that strikes one here is the disproportionately small number of lines that the Syriac has to contribute in addition to the common basis. And this only comes out more strikingly if we start, not from the 504 lines common to all four texts, but—as would for some purposes be more convenient—from the 521 common to the three versions (*GSL*). To *this* common basis of 521 lines, then, *L* adds 205 lines, *G* and *H* 199 and 196, respectively, but *S* only 25.

The omissions of the Syriac version are of two kinds—detached lines, and continuous passages. If any inferences, however, as to the relation of the Syriac and Hebrew texts are to be drawn from chaps. 39–49, it must be remembered that the most of *S*'s great lacunæ occur here. In fact out of the total of 214 lines excluded by the Syriac, the great lacunæ account for no less than 138.² Whatever theory be adopted in explanation of these lacunæ, however, the seventy-six detached lines that the Syriac excludes leave it beyond a doubt the shortest text.³

3. *Range of the Greek text.*—The frequent omissions of the Syriac were, however, already a well-known feature. The really new fact is that the Hebrew additions to the common basis are practically equal in extent to those of the Greek. This is, however, accidental; the equality of amount is not due to identity of range; the one text is full where the other is lacking. The Greek has as many as twenty-nine

² The passages omitted are 39:17c–20a = 9 lines; 41:13a–42:8d = 50 lines (broken into two by the insertion of several lines representing the end of chap. 41, and containing some very remarkable additions, on which see below, No. 9, b); 43:11c–33b = 55 lines; 45:8c–14b = 24 lines.

³ The omissions of the other texts are as follows: *L*, 34 lines; *G*, 40 lines; *H*, 43 lines.

lines not to be found in the Hebrew, and the Hebrew twenty-six not in the Greek. This leaves indeed no less than 187 lines common to Hebrew and Greek in addition to the general substratum of 504 common to all the four texts. But this need not be taken to mean a specially close relation between the Greek in particular and the Hebrew. For, as a matter of fact, it is only when supported by other witnesses also that these two texts go together either in including or in excluding a line. They never do so alone.

(a) The *inclusions* may be taken first. The 187 Greek lines just referred to as found also in Hebrew are all likewise to be found in the Latin—except two⁴ that are found in the Syriac.⁵ Indeed it would be in some ways natural to regard rather the Latin than the Hebrew as parallel to the Greek. For while, as we have just seen, the Hebrew confirms the great mass of such additional lines of the Greek as are shared by *L*, *L* goes on with *G* after *H* stops. At all events it is plain that the Greek never once stands alone with the Hebrew in contributing a new line.

(b) And the same thing is true of the *exclusions*. When the Greek excludes a line it is invariably confirmed in so doing by one of the other versions—*S* eleven times, *L* twenty-two times. As we have just seen that the Greek hardly ever (only thrice⁶) agrees with the Syriac in inclusions, our attention is at once attracted when we observe it beginning to run parallel with it in omissions. And this relation of Greek and Syriac becomes more interesting still when we note the behavior of the Hebrew. This is quite startling. With few exceptions⁷ it supports the Greek in its exclusions whenever the latter goes with the Syriac, and opposes it when it goes with the Latin.

4. *Range of the Syriac and Latin texts.*—The Syriac and the Latin thus stand relatively to the Greek in converse positions. Their connection with each other, on the other hand, resembles in one point that of the Greek and Hebrew. The latter pair agree, as already stated, only when supported by one other witness or more. And so

⁴ Viz., 39:16 *b* and 45:25 *c*.

⁵ With a single exception (40:12 *a*, common to *GS*) the remaining 29 Greek lines (*i. e.*, over and above the 504 common to all four texts, and the 187 common to *HGL*) which the Hebrew does not confirm, are in the Latin—for the two lines that are formally peculiar to the Greek (39:17 *ab*) are really, as we shall see (below, No. 9, *a*), in *L* as 39:21 *ab*. Two-thirds (17) of them, however, are simply the lines common to the three versions but excluded by the Hebrew.

⁶ See two preceding notes.

⁷ On these see below (No. 8 (*c*) for *S*, and No. 9 (*b*) for *L*).

g and *L* agree only in company with *g*.⁸ It is not surprising to find this group, the three versions, then, generally confirmed by the Hebrew (504 out of 521 times).

(a) As for the Syriac in particular, it diverges from the Hebrew, as we have already remarked, by omitting a large number of lines, and it is only when it omits along with *g* that its omissions in the main do not constitute a divergence from *H*. Its additions (25) are much less numerous than its omissions (207), and mostly single-handed (22). Unlike the omissions, they are almost all⁹ supported by *H*.

(b) The Latin is quite the reverse. The longest of our sources, it hardly ever (only thrice¹⁰) omits alone. Its length, however, is not due to the absence of omissions, for there are over a score of these, and almost all of those shared by *g* (the vast majority) are not omitted by *H*. *L*'s length is due to its additions. By far the most of these are shared by *g* (194) and confirmed by *H* (185). But when *g* omits (11), *H* (and *g*) omits also (10).

5. *Range of agreement of the three versions.*—With regard to lines attested by *gSL* all we shall say at this point is that in the vast majority of cases they represent an *H* text. Of the seven lines that *H* adds and the seventeen it omits as compared with the versions, we shall speak later on. Meanwhile, reviewing the details we have gathered, what generalizations can we make?

6. *General result.*—When the Greek and Syriac agree in excluding a line—a minority, however, of *g*'s exclusions, and a mere fraction of *g*'s—they are supported by the Hebrew, that is to say, their text is then similar in range to *H*'s. On the contrary, when it is only the Latin that *g* agrees with in excluding lines, *i. e.*, in all the rest (the majority) of *g*'s omissions, it is opposed by *H*, that is to say, its text is defective in range as compared with that of *H*. In another respect also *g* and *L* are opposite. While *L* hardly ever omits single-handed, in the 194 cases where *g* does so it is all but universally (185 times) deserted by *H* also. That is to say, to the observation that when *g* and *g* agree in exclusions their text is similar in range to *H*'s we must add the complementary observation, that when either of them goes beyond the other in excluding lines, it is producing a text more limited in range than *H*.¹¹ If then, we could suppose that the character of the various

⁸ On the two formal exceptions (39: 17 *ab*) see below, No. 9 (*a*).

⁹ On the five exceptions see below, No. 9 (*b* and *c*).

¹⁰ *Viz.*, 39: 16 *b*, 45: 25 *c*, and 40: 12 *a*—the last omission confirmed by *H*.

¹¹ In the case of *g*'s extra exclusions of this kind it is to be noted that *L* as well as *g* represents *H*'s text.

versions is about the same throughout the rest of the book as in chaps. 39-49, we should have three general tendencies discernible in inclusions and exclusions: a tendency on the part of *H* to confirm *GS* exclusions, to oppose *GL* exclusions, and to confirm *GL* inclusions. This may be expressed antithetically as a tendency to confirm *GS* exclusions and *S* or *GL* inclusions; to oppose *L* inclusions and *GL* or *S* exclusions.

7. *Meaning of the facts.*—Do these facts suggest any theory? It is not indeed the object of the present article to propound one. But, in view of the interest felt just now in *H* in particular, it is natural to ask whether it may not be that *S* represents at basis a text resembling in its range that of *H*, but only partially preserved or seriously mutilated. It certainly seems to be the case that whenever, of the versions, *S* includes lines single-handed, we may expect to find *H* including also. Furthermore, if *S* omits, *H* omits also, provided that *G* does so too. Of course this is in a very small proportion of cases. Still it is not unnatural to regard *S* as to this extent faithfully reproducing a text equivalent in range to *H*, free for example from the extra matter in *L*. When, however, *S* and *G* go beyond this in excluding lines—what is to be said? Can the same explanation apply to both? *S* goes its way quite independently. Does this represent a mutilated manuscript? or a Syriac recension? *G* on the other hand is accompanied by *L*. Does this represent faithful adherence of the Latin to the limits of the Greek? or a common restricted source? One thing is clear: *L* also admits text-matter going beyond the range of *H*, and it is only sometimes that *G* then keeps it company.

8. *Character of inclusions and exclusions.*—So far we have considered simply the relative range of the various sources, whether greater than, equal to, or less than *H*; or asked, what inferences could be drawn from difference of range. Nor is this the place or time to try to estimate the relative value of these sources as determined by the character of the text in distinction from its range. Such a task could be satisfactorily grappled with only in the course of a critical comparison of them line by line and word by word.

Our study would, however, be incomplete without an account of the inclusions and exclusions that we have observed. Further examination may very likely modify in some points the classification of hemistichs on which the above analysis is based; it is proverbially easy, in the course of the frequent modifications which the details of such an analysis have to undergo, for errors and discrepancies to fail

of detection ; and as already intimated opinions will always differ in some cases as to how the lines should be counted ; but such corrections or modifications will probably hardly affect the general result. We propose, therefore, to quote the lines that seem to be omitted by the Hebrew text,¹² and then those that appear there for the first time. In citing the verses we shall in some cases append a comment on the lines ; but the primary object is, not to pronounce judgment, but to collect the material in a convenient form so that anyone who cares may study it for himself. The general nature of the exclusions and inclusions will appear at once.

9. *Exclusions of H.*—The Hebrew omits some 43 lines, viz., 2 found in *G* alone, 4 in *S*, 1 in *GS*, 10 in *L*, 9 in *GL* and 17 in *GL*.
a) *Lines peculiar to G.*—These appear to be only two, 39:17 *ab* :

None can say, What is this? Wherefore is that?
For in his season they shall all be sought out.

But these are really the same as those occurring in *L* as 39:21 *ab*, which seem to be a fusion of 39: 21 *ab* [*H*] and 21 *cd* [*H*]. If now we look at these two couplets in Hebrew

כִּי הַכֵּל לְצִרְכּוֹ נִבְחַר	אֵין לֵאמֹר זֶה לְמַחֲזָה
כִּי הַכֵּל בַּעֲתוֹ יִגְבֹּר	אֵין לֵאמֹר [זֶה רַעְמֻזָּה]

we see how easily one might be a variant of the other: the marginal reading removes even the difference in the last two words, while the Latin and Greek, as we have seen, appear to fuse the two couplets together. It is at least worth while considering whether the whole four lines may not be a Hebrew gloss. *b) Lines peculiar to S.*—These appear to be four. But one of these again, 48:3*c*:

On the altar and on wicked men,

is surely a gloss on bringing down fire from heaven. The same cannot be said of 39:21*c*:

By his word he maketh the sun to rise, and by his word he maketh it set
In so doubtful a context it is hazardous to pronounce definitely.
41:20*a* *ab*:

[He is a great robber]

The salutation thou givest him he returneth thee not:

The trust thou hast committed to him, how will he restore it thee?

This couplet may possibly have originated as an explanation of a cor-

¹² Latin quotations are given in the original, but instead of printing the Greek lines the rendering of the English Revised Version is usually adopted.

rupted and therefore misunderstood vs. 20a. *c) Lines peculiar to GS.*
—There seems to be only one not confirmed by *H*, viz., 40:12a:

All bribery and injustice shall be blotted out:
Syr. Every sinner and ungodly man shall perish.

The next hemistich is also omitted by *H* (and cod. 307 of the Greek) though *L* preserves it. Both hemistichs could perhaps easily be spared.

d) Lines peculiar to L.—There are 10 such, but 41:21 *aa*:

Ne avertas faciem a proximo tuo [et ammirabilis magnificentia eius],
and 43:30b *aβ*:

Benedicentes dominum, exultati illum quantum potestis,
Maior est enim omni laude,

may be duplicates of what precedes them; and so 47:8*f*:

Et dedit illi contra inimicos potentiam.

may = vs. 8*d* of *H* (*cf.* the final Ξ which the editors detect), as vs. 8 *ca* seems to be an expansion of vs. 8*c* in *H*. 48:2*c*:

Non poterant enim sustinere precepta domini.

looks not unlike an explanatory gloss, while 48:20*c aβ*:

Non est commemoratus peccatorum illorum
Neque dedit illos inimicis suis,

is not improbably a later expansion. 47:25*c*:

Et ab omnibus peccatis liberant eos

hardly looks as if it were original. On the other hand 48:6 *aβ*:

Et confregisti facile potentiam ipsorum

may be an independent reading to which vs. 6*b* of *H* was subsequently appended. The very interesting line 48:11*c*:

Post mortem autem non erit tale nomen nostrum,

we are precluded from pronouncing upon by the unfortunate break in the Hebrew manuscript which deprives us of vs. 11*b*.

Apart from one or two doubtful cases, then, the peculiar additions of *L*, which is, moreover, as we saw, the longest of the sources, seem hardly to have, at least in any marked degree, the distinctive note of originality. *e) Lines peculiar to GL.*—These are nine, and after what we have seen of the vast number of cases (185) where the combination *GL* is supported by *H*, one is interested to discover the character of the additions not so confirmed. Apart from 41:22*ab*:

Et ne scruteris ancillam eius
Neque steteris ad lectum eius

which occur in a context varying too much in the different texts to be of use to us here, and 43:15*ab*, 16*ab* where we have not the means of determining which two of the four lines it is that *H* omits; and 47:25*b*:

Till vengeance should come upon them,

about which different opinions might be held; the *GL* lines are at least not beyond the suspicion of being subsequent accretions. 42:5*b*:

And of much correction of children.

Note the transpositions in the context. 43:31*ab*:

Whq hath seen him that he may declare him?

And who shall magnify him as he is?

It could be argued that the context does not greatly need the couplet. 44:15*b*:

And the congregation telleth out their praise.

Like line *a* (also omitted by *H* but preserved in *8*) this might be an addition explaining how "their name liveth to all generations."

Thus the combination *GL*, which we have found to be usually parallel to *H*, seems, when representing a more extensive text than *H*, to be not infrequently of questionable value. *f*) *Lines peculiar to G8L*.—It remains to examine the cases where all the three versions agree in going beyond *H*. 40:2*ab*:

The expectation of things to come and the day of death

[] their thoughts, and [] fear of heart.

Would the context lose by the omission of the couplet? 40:12*b*:

And faith shall stand forever.

Clause *a* is omitted by *L*, and both are perhaps not very necessary. 42:18*cd*:

For the Most High knoweth all knowledge

And he looketh into the signs of the world.

The Syriac is much briefer: is the whole a gloss? 42:22*ab*:

How desirable are all his works,

One may behold this even unto a spark.

So in the English version. The Greek readings vary, and the meaning is obscure. The Syriac differs much.

On 43:15–16 see above. 44:12*ab*:

Their seed standeth fast

And their children for their sakes.

44:15*a*:

People will declare their wisdom.

Somewhat like a gloss on "their name liveth," vs. 15*b*, which is parallel, is omitted by *8*. 44:21*c*:

That he would multiply him as the dust of the earth,
And exalt his seed as the stars (Syr., above all nations).

These lines may have been supplied from Genesis ; but the context seems to require them, and they may have been omitted in *H* by *homoioteleuton* (cf. נִיִּים at end of vs. 21*b* and 'ammē at end of vs. 21*d* in *S*). The second is omitted by cod. 248. 45:26*b* :

To judge his people in righteousness ;

8, "in his name ;" the parallelism seems to require a line. 46:12*a* :

May their bones flourish again out of their place (Syr., like lilies).

The absence of this line from *H* is noteworthy. Does the way vs. 12*b* is written in the Hebrew manuscript indicate that it is a later addition ? 47:16*ab* :

Thy name reached unto the isles afar off,
And for thy peace thou wast beloved.

The play on Solomon's name in εἰρήνη (corrupted in the Syriac and transposed into shem'ākh), and that on Jedidiah in ἡγαπήθης, plead for the originality of the lines (cf. similar paronomasia in the case of Samuel 46:13*b*, Rehoboam 47:23*c*, Hezekiah 48:17*a*, Isaiah 48:20*d*).

It would seem, therefore, that in cases of *BSL versus H*, every line must be judged on its own merits.

10. *Additions of H*. —The new lines in *H* seem to be only seven in number. 39:20*b* :

[Is there] limit to his salvation ?

39:30*c* :

All these are created (margin, chosen) for their uses.

41:9*aβ* :

[And if ye] beget, it shall be for sighing.

45:7*e* :

And clothed him with bells.

45:25*f* :

Who crowned you with glory.

46:19*ef* :

Also till the time of his death

He was found prudent in the sight of the Lord and in the sight of all living

It will be evident at once that none of these lines is of importance. Some are obscure, probably corrupt, and others, read in Hebrew, look, as already noted, suspiciously like duplicates of lines in the immediate context.¹³

¹³It is hardly necessary to repeat that the comments or queries appended to many of the above citations are not meant in any sense as a mature estimate of their char-

Our preliminary survey leaves us, therefore, with the assurance that the newly discovered Hebrew text is a most valuable witness, but with the suspicion that it may not be free from both omissions and interpolations. A real estimate of its worth must depend on a critical examination of the character of its readings. It is fortunate that this new text has become available in time for Professor Smend to make use of it in the commentary on Ecclesiasticus on which we believe he is engaged.¹⁴

HOPE W. HOGG.

OXFORD, ENGLAND, Feb. 20, 1897.

acter. They are merely intended to justify the very general and quite provisional conclusion finally reached.

¹⁴It may be worth while to exhibit some of the facts chronicled above in tabular form. We append therefore two tables. The first is a simple list showing the attestation of the different lines. The second deals with lines found in the versions, and contains a series of numbers presented in the form of vulgar fractions. The numerator tells how many of the lines mentioned in the denominator are confirmed by the Hebrew. That is to say, the fraction represents the probability of a line attested in a certain way being found in the Hebrew. It is not meant to imply that such numerical estimates can be of much practical value in dealing with the portions of the text not yet recovered in Hebrew; but this seemed the most interesting form in which to present the facts. It may be well to add that in speaking, as we have frequently done, of the Hebrew as "confirming" a reading, we are not to be understood as ascribing any particular degree of authority to the Hebrew text. The word was used simply for the sake of brevity.

TABLE I.

ATTESTATION OF LINES.

<i>H</i>	7	<i>HG</i>	0	<i>HGS</i>	2
<i>G</i>	2	<i>HS</i>	18	<i>HSL</i>	0
<i>S</i>	4	<i>HL</i>	1	<i>HGL</i>	185
<i>L</i>	10	<i>GS</i>	1		—
	—	<i>GL</i>	9		187
	23	<i>SL</i>	0	<i>GSL</i>	17
		—		<i>HGSL</i>	504
			29		

TABLE II.

INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS OF THE VERSIONS.

G's inclusions: alone, $\frac{2}{3}$; with *S*, $\frac{3}{8}$; with *L*, $\frac{185}{504}$
G's exclusions: " 0; " $\frac{11}{12}$; " $\frac{1}{24}$
S's inclusions: alone, $\frac{1}{2}$; with *G*, $\frac{3}{8}$; with *L*, 0
S's exclusions: " $\frac{1}{24}$; " $\frac{11}{12}$; " $\frac{3}{8}$
L's inclusions: alone, $\frac{1}{1}$; with *G*, $\frac{185}{504}$; with *S*, 0
L's exclusions: " $\frac{1}{8}$; " $\frac{1}{24}$; " $\frac{3}{8}$